

Edwards,Michelle

From: Elliott,Earl
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 11:15 AM
To: Bennett,Duke A; Edwards,Michelle
Subject: Fw: Storm Water Fee

FILED

JUN 30 2016

Duke, FYI, Earl

CITY CLERK

Michelle, Please post on City Council website and ?or forward to all Council members. Thanks, Earl

From: Ward Hubbard <ward@wabashvalleypkg.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 8:04 AM
To: Elliott,Earl
Subject: Storm Water Fee

Mr. Elliott,

I write to express my concerns with the proposed Storm Water Fee.

As a resident of the county, and not the City, I do not have an elected official representing me in this matter, however, the fee will affect me as a resident and as a business owner in the Sanitary District. I believe a significant portion of the county residents affected to not know this.

My first concern with the fee is the "simple" manner in which it is applied. The Mayor was quoted in the Tribune Star that it is just like a utility fee. Well it is NOT. ALL of my utilities have two components to their fee. The first is the system cost to provide the electrical service, or the water, or gas, or sewer. The second component is based on use. I pay for the amount of water or electricicty used.

Everyone who is connected to the city sewer within the sanitary district already pays some amount to provide the service, and an amount of service provided based upon water use. This makes perfect sense. It is so logical that water service provided for yard sprinkler systems is NOT included in my current sewer bill.

The sewer fee however has nothing to do with either the cost of the system or the amount of service it provides. No sewers were built in the Vigo County Industrial Park to handle storm water runoff. As a matter of fact, costs were incurred to manage water runoff in the design of the park. I paid for that when I purchased my property in the Park. Secondly, I send nothing in the manner of storm water to the sewer system.

If indeed a Storm Water Fee is needed, the application of that fee should be based on the cost of the system and the amount of service it provides.

Secondly, all other "Utilities" provide an incentive to reduce use. If I can recycle water in my manufacturing process, I lower my water costs and my cost to manufacturer. The Duke Energy has taken that a step farther by incentivizing the replacement of inefficient motors and lighting with more efficient systems.

The Storm Water Fee provides no incentive to reduce storm water runoff.

If indeed the Sanitary District is required by Federal Mandate to meet certain standards, and there are costs to meet those mandates, then those costs should be recovered from the sources that "incurred" those costs, NOT in some universal coverage that has nothing to do with the costs incurred.

Your Truly,

Ward Hubbard
President
Wabash Valley Packaging Corporation

FILED

JUN 30 2016

CITY CLERK